DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 122 TM 800 166

AUTHOR Walsh, James A.: And Others
TITLE Influence of Response Sets on Authoritarian and Non-Authoritarian Attitude Scales.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 20p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association (Las Vegas, NV, April, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults: Anti Semitism: *Authoritarianism: Dogmatism: Ethnocentrism: Factor Analysis: *Factor Structure: Higher Education: *Personality Assessment: *Personality Measures: *Response Style (Tests): *Social Attitudes: Test Items: Totalitarianism
IDENTIFIERS Adorno (T W)

ABSTRACT

An attempt was made to examine authoritarian and non-authoritarian scales of social attitudes and their reversals as a function of: (1) content consistency: (2) acquiescence: and (3) a tendency to use extreme categories of response. The study questioned whether Adorno's fascism (F), dogmatism (D), ethnocentrism (E), and anti-Semitism (A-S) scales measure authoritarian attitudes or whether the responses obtained are systematically biased in some way unrelated to overt content variables. A pilot study, which involved 75 male and 75 female college students, did not elicit the expected factor structure. Instead, eight factors emerged which were later replicated in a sample of 250 male college students. The eight factors showed responses to the F and D scales to be highly determined by an agreement response bias, whereas E and A-S are largely content-determined. Distinct sets to employ extreme responses and to be equivocal about item responses also emerged. A separate factor representing a strongly negativistic response tendency was found. In addition, the expected liberal conservative factor appeared as did a factor indicating that logical reversal of items is ineffective. (Author/CTM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185122

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James A. Walsh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Influence of Response Sets on Authoritarian and Non-Authoritarian Attitude Scales

by

James A. Walsh

University of Montana

C. Blake Keasey

Loma Linda Medical Center

Carol A. Tomlinson-Keasey

University of California Riverside

Paper presented at the meetings of the Rocky Mountain Psychological Association

Las Vegas

April, 1979

TM800 166

For many years there has been controversy about the nature of the scales derived by Adorno et al. (1950) in their study of the authoritarian personality. The basic issue is whether these scales, the Fascism (F), Dogmatism (D), Ethnocentrism (E), and Anti-Semitism (A-S) scales, do in fact measure an authoritarian attitude or attitudes, or whether the responses obtained are systematically biased in a manner unrelated to the target variables.

Peabody (1966) depicted these items as "particularly susceptible to response bias" for four reasons.

1) The items are ambiguous. Each item was constructed to cover two or more content areas and both rational and irrational aspects of content. When coupled with the extreme length of many of the items, such characteristics cannot help but produce ambiguity.

2) There is a total imbalance of item keying. All items in the F, D, E, and A-S scales are keyed in the same positive direction. Thus response biases such as acquiescence can summate and systematically contaminate the total scores of all these scales.

3) Item content is not systematically determined. The items in these scales were not selected on the basis of homogeneity or because they differentiated among criterion groups; rather, they were selected because they possessed content or face validity. Thus the items in the F Scale are supposed to tap the nine theoretical characteristics of the authoritarian personality, but, because they are double-barreled, this claim seems to be illogical.

4) Finally, the items are stated very strongly. It could be that the decisive wording of the items persuades vacillating respondents to agree with them when the content alone would not.

Peabody (1966) tried to sift out response biases in the authoritarian

scales by writing reversals of the original items such that a respondent might logically endorse the original and disagree with the reversal. In a study in which subjects responded to boththe original items and their reversed forms, Peabody (1966) found that 58%, 60%, and 72% of the F, D, and A-S item responses, respectively, were consistent with the content, that is, the subjects gave the opposite response to the reversed form of the item. But Peabody additionally found that 33%, 32%, and 19% of those who agreed with the original item also agreed with the reversal of that item for the F, D, and A-S scales, respectively.

These results seem to indicate that both an authoritarian attitude and an acquiescence response set are measured by these scales. If they are independent, it should be possible to separate these two tendencies into two components, an authoritarian factor represented by content-consistent responses, and an acquiescence factor marked by agree responses to both the original and reversed forms of the items.

A major purpose of the present study then was to include in a factor analysis total scores on both original and reversed forms of the authoritarian scales, as well as the numbers of content-consistent responses and the numbers of acquiescent responses for each scale. It was hypothesized that the latter two sets of measures should define separate factors if they are indeed independent and that the first set of measures should load on both of these factors.

Since most social attitude scales presumably differ from authoritarian scales quantitatively rather than qualitatively, it was considered informative to examine the factor structure of a number of non-authoritarian attitude measures in relation to the content-consistent and acquiescence measures. In an earlier study, Walsh (1963) showed that the principal response determiner

in non-authoritarian attitude scales is a liberal-conservative set for males and a similar set confounded by a tendency to give extreme responses for females. No acquiescence factor was identified. The majority of attitude scales appeared to be relatively free of acquiescence, whereas authoritarian scales do not. Non-authoritarian attitude scales should, therefore, load primarily on factors other than an acquiescence factor. They might be hypothesized to load on the same factor as the content portion of the authoritarian scales if authoritarian attitudes represent an extreme of conservatism.

The tendency to respond in an extreme fashion is often cited as a characteristic of the authoritarian personality. Hence, extreme responses to authoritarian scales are explained as part and parcel of authoritarianism. However, Walsh (1963) found that the tendency to use extreme categories of response formed an independent factor for males and was completely confounded with liberal-conservatism for females. The latter finding is supported by the work of other investigators (Broen and Wirt, 1958; Cowen, 1961). If distinct tendencies to use extreme categories of response exist for traditional attitude scales and authoritarian scales, measures of the two tendencies should load on separate factors and should tend to place authoritarian-derived measures of extreme response on the content-consistent factor and the traditionally-based measure on an independent factor.

The tendency to use undecided responses has been identified as a stable response mode by Edwards and Walsh (1963) and by Walsh (1963). However, other investigators (Bass, 1961) have postulated that a tendency to respond consistently to ambiguous stimuli is one of the determiners of the authoritarian scale score. Thus persons who use the undecided response category in answering ambiguous items might be expected to agree consistently with the

more strongly stated authoritarian items. If this supposition is true, then a measure of the tendency to say "undecided" should load on the content-consistent factor. If this is not true, this measure should define an independent factor.

Defenders of the authoritarian scales (Rokeach, 1963; Samelson, 1964) depict double agree (acquiescence) and double disagree (negativism) responses as occurring on items for which the reversal switches the content of the item but does not reverse the intent of the original statement. If this were true one would ordinarily expect that an equal number of double agree and double disagree responses would occur. Such is the case with the MMPI (Rorer and Goldberg, 1965). However, in the F, D, and A-S scales double disagree responses account for only 9%, 8%, and 9% respectively of the responses while double agree responses occur 33%, 32%, and 19% of the time, respectively. If negativism is in fact the opposite of acquiescence, then measures of these tendencies should load on the opposite poles of the same factor. However, if negativism is an independent mode of response, it should define a separate factor.

Walsh's (1963) factor analysis of attitude scales showed that the principal factor underlying responses to these scales represents a liberal-conservative set for male subjects. In addition, a subject's estimate of his own political orientation loads on this liberal-conservative factor (Walsh and Keasey, 1966). Thus, the liberal-conservative factor is well defined. If the authoritarian scales measure a similar liberal-conservative factor, they should load substantially on this factor.

The general purpose of this study, then, was to analyze the factor structure of the authoritarian scales (including Adorno et al.'s Conservative

Scale) in relation to a (1) liberal-conservatism, (2) acquiescence, (3) the tendency to give extreme responses, (4) the tendency to give undecided responses, and (5) a tendency to give negative or double-disagree responses. The specific variables included in the analysis are listed in Table 1.

PROCEDURE

A pilot study relevant to these questions was conducted. The subjects were 75 males and 75 females. All of the male subjects and 26 of the female subjects were students at Midwestern College. The remaining 49 females were student nurses at Iowa Lutheran Hospital in Des Moines, Iowa. The questionnaires were administered in three separate booklets at time intervals of approximately one week. The first booklet contained the original F, D, E, A-S, and Conservative scales plus the subject's own rating of his political orientation.

The results of the pilot study did not confirm the hypotheses, but provided a strikingly clear factor structure. The resulting factor structure was cross validated on another sample of 250 male subjects from the University of Montana tested in the same fashion as the original sample.

RESULTS

The responses of the 150 pilot study subjects to the scales listed in Table 1 were intercorrelated and factor analyzed. The fit of the obtained factors to the hypothesized structure was so slight that neither merits further discussion here.

A condensation procedure was next applied to the data. Eight principal components factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 accounting for 70.2 percent of the total variance were extracted and rotated to a varimax definition of simple structure. These eight factors exhibited such a clear-cut, if not *a priori* obvious, structure that a second and much larger sample (*n* =

250) of freshman and sophomore male college students was obtained in order to cross-validate the factor structure. The pattern suggested by the condensation solution is given in Table 1. The fit of the data from the 250 males to this structure is given in Table 2. The factoring technique used in this hypothesis solution was a group centroid procedure in which orthogonal factors were successively removed and partialled out of the previous residual matrix.

The solution obtained appears to be an extremely good one. The amount of variance accounted for is 68.6 percent, which is very slightly less than that accounted for in the first analysis and quite similar to the usual estimates of the reliability of attitude measures. The ordering with respect to size of the factors (in terms of variance accounted for) is exactly the same as in the first analysis, although several of the factors are quite similar in size. In every case but one, the 47 variables load highest on the factor they were hypothesized to load on. There are only 11 loadings greater than |.40| on factors where loadings were not hypothesized. For only five of the variables was the amount of common variance accounted for less than 50 percent of the total, and for only two variables was it less than 45 percent. One of these latter variables is the Nationalism Scale (variable 15) which is also the variable whose highest loading was on a non-hypothesized factor. The individual factors all appear to be internally consistent and rationally coherent. They are interpreted below.

Factor 1 appears to confirm the hypothesis that responses to the original F and D scales (non-reversed) are influenced primarily by an agreement response bias. The variables with high loadings on factor 1 are given in Table 3.

Table 1

Variables Included in the Study and Factor Pattern from Initial Data

Variable		Factors I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	Keying
1. Fascism Scale (F)	A.P. *Scales	-1								F
2. Ethnocentrism Scale (E)	A.P. *Scales			1						E
3. Dogmatism Scale (D)	A.P. *Scales	-1								D
4. Anti-Semitism Scale (A-S)	A.P. *Scales			1						A-S
5. Conservatism Scale (C)	A.P. *Scales						-1			C
6. Reversed F Scale	Reversed A.P. Scales							1		Anti-F
7. Reversed D Scale	Reversed A.P. Scales							1		Anti-D
8. Reversed A-S Scale	Reversed A.P. Scales			1						Pro-S
9. Reversed C Scale	Reversed A.P. Scales						-1			Anti-C
10. Liberalism-Conservatism Scale	Non-A.P. Attitude Scales						1			Liberal
11. Modern Political Attitudes Scale	Non-A.P. Attitude Scales						1			Liberal
12. Worldmindedness Scale	Non-A.P. Attitude Scales			-1						Worldminded
13. Civil Rights Scale	Non-A.P. Attitude Scales			-1						Pro-C.R.
14. Militarism-Pacifism Scale	Non-A.P. Attitude Scales								-1	Pacifist
15. Nationalism Scale	Non-A.P. Attitude Scales								1	Nationalist
16. Humanitarianism Scale	Non-A.P. Attitude Scales								1	Anti-H.
17. Capital Punishment Scale	Non-A.P. Attitude Scales								1	Pro-C.P.
18. Political Position Self-Rating					1					Liberal
19. No. Strongly Agree Responses to A.P. Scales					1					
20. No. Strongly Disagree Responses to A.P. Scales					1					
21. No. Undecided Responses to A.P. Scales			1							
22. No. Strongly Agree Responses to Reversed A.P. Scales					1					
23. No. Strongly Disagree Responses to Reversed A.P. Scales					1					
24. No. Undecided Responses to Reversed A.P. Scales			1							

*Authoritarian Personality

Table 1 (continued)

Variable	Factors I	Ii	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII
25. No. Strongly Agree Responses to Attitude Scales				1				
26. No. Strongly Disagree Responses to Attitude Scales				1				
27. No. Undecided Responses to Attitude Scales		1						
28. Total Agree-Agree Responses to A.P. Scales	-1							
29. Total Agree-Disagree Responses to A.P. Scales							1	
30. Total Disagree-Agree Responses to A.P. Scales		-1						
31. Total Disagree-Disagree Responses to A.P. Scales					1			
32. Agree-Agree Responses to F - Reversed F	-1							
33. Agree-Disagree Responses to F - Reversed F							1	
34. Disagree-Agree Responses to F - Reversed F		-1						
35. Disagree-Disagree Responses to F - Reversed F					1			
36. Agree-Agree Responses to D - Reversed D	-1							
37. Agree-Disagree Responses to D - Reversed D							1	
38. Disagree-Agree Responses to D - Reversed D		-1						
39. Disagree-Disagree Responses to D - Reversed D					1			
40. Agree-Agree Responses to C - Reversed C	-1							
41. Agree-Disagree Responses to C - Reversed C						-1		
42. Disagree-Agree Responses to C - Reversed C		-1						
43. Disagree-Disagree Responses to C - Reversed C					1			
44. Agree-Agree Responses to A-S/ Reversed A-S			1					
45. Agree-Disagree Responses to A-S/ Reversed A-S			1					
46. Disagree-Agree Responses to A-S/ Reversed A-S			-1					
47. Disagree-Disagree Responses to A-S/ Reversed A-S					1			

Table 2

Factor Loadings in Hypothesis Solution on Cross-Validation Sample

Variable	$\bar{X}$	s	Length	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	h^2
1.	54.57	12.05	27	-79*	42	10	01	01	05	14	03	84
2.	32.65	11.66	20	-39	42	57*	-05	-13	-01	-08	03	69
3.	81.40	13.04	40	-80*	25	02	06	-09	00	27	-09	80
4.	14.89	9.36	14	-17	35	80*	-07	-08	05	-03	00	81
5.	34.44	7.15	16	-27	21	28	-07	-31	-63*	-00	-07	70
6.	40.85	8.24	27	04	44	25	11	37	07	45*	00	62
7.	60.63	8.78	40	24	26	30	23	19	-13	54*	07	61
8.	17.85	6.86	14	-07	43	62*	-10	22	-02	00	-12	65
9.	34.15	7.35	16	39	00	17	21	42	-63*	10	02	81
10.	35.29	5.98	20	-30	15	-27	-14	07	58*	17	-08	59
11.	55.64	8.51	23	-13	-33	-23	04	02	54*	-01	-02	47
12.	43.43	7.94	20	05	-33	-65*	04	-02	15	-06	-09	57
13.	43.75	7.71	20	27	-30	-57*	13	04	-07	-16	05	54
14.	36.93	9.35	20	21	-11	-28	-11	05	-02	-11	-62*	55
15.	56.28	7.98	25	-42	09	34	11	08	09	16	-11	37
16.	51.15	11.90	25	-24	17	22	15	-08	00	03	77*	76
17.	28.77	8.98	15	-33	11	14	15	-09	06	06	70*	67
18.	50.84	19.77	100	04	-08	-01	40*	-14	08	01	-14	21
19.	3.68	3.73	97	-45	-03	30	61*	-03	-09	17	12	72
20.	7.20	6.94	97	18	-39	-29	67*	11	00	02	08	74
21.	25.75	14.77	97	23	86*	-03	-18	-13	18	-05	-03	87
22.	4.85	5.67	97	-07	-38	-28	62*	-12	06	-24	-04	69
23.	2.19	3.09	97	01	-17	05	73*	32	-09	-05	-02	68
24.	19.17	12.92	97	24	85*	-01	03	-12	19	-06	-03	83
25.	6.41	4.95	168	-33	-31	08	70*	-20	01	06	-10	75
26.	8.40	6.62	168	07	-29	06	75*	06	03	03	09	68
27.	40.53	24.77	168	31	76*	-19	-19	-23	08	-11	-01	82
28.	17.61	9.23	97	-96*	-21	01	-03	05	-02	-10	01	97
29.	11.13	5.37	97	-28	-27	40	24	-01	-51	54*	-06	92
30.	27.64	11.32	97	39	-85*	-21	-10	-11	01	-08	-02	96
31.	6.33	5.02	97	18	-36	12	27	84*	02	00	02	96
32.	6.21	3.48	27	-86*	-11	-05	01	06	-10	-03	02	77
33.	2.72	1.78	27	-39	-04	22	21	11	12	58*	-05	62
34.	6.95	4.28	27	50	-75*	-01	-04	-18	-02	-09	-08	86
35.	1.63	1.57	27	26	-31	15	23	58*	-08	06	-07	59
36.	9.15	4.98	40	-88*	-23	-04	-06	08	02	-10	01	86
37.	4.32	2.82	40	-11	-28	19	33	-04	-29	58*	04	65
38.	10.65	5.28	40	45	-72*	03	-09	-02	-06	-03	06	73
39.	2.24	2.48	40	22	-31	06	17	56*	-06	11	16	53
40.	1.77	1.75	16	-65*	-12	-04	00	-09	05	-18	01	50
41.	3.65	2.45	16	-08	-21	25	-05	-07	-79*	06	-06	75
42.	2.37	2.01	16	-16	-53*	-04	-10	-19	52	-01	-04	63
43.	1.25	1.92	16	25	-23	-03	31	60*	14	-01	00	59
44.	0.59	1.07	14	-28	-05	58*	10	04	07	-11	11	45
45.	0.39	0.94	14	-27	-01	67*	23	-05	-16	11	05	62
46.	3.00	3.71	14	12	-51	-69*	-06	-03	-15	12	10	80
47.	1.00	1.17	14	-16	-11	05	16	58*	-02	-16	-12	46
Variance accounted for (%)				14.98	14.95	10.09	8.20	6.39	6.25	4.11	3.58	68.55

* Highest loading on factor indicated by pattern in initial data.

___ Loading $\geq|.40|$ on factor other than that indicated by pattern in initial data.

☐ Highest loading on factor other than that indicated by pattern in initial data.

Table 3

High Loadings on Factor 1

Scale	Loading
Facism Scale	- .79
Dogmatism Scale	- .80
Total Agree-Agree Responses to A.P. Scales	- .96
No. Agree-Agree Responses to F - Reversed F	- .86
No. Agree-Agree Responses to D - Reversed D	- .88
No. Agree-Agree Responses to C - Reversed C	- .65

The conviction that the agreement response is inherent in and due to the particular characteristics of the authoritarian personality scales seems to be borne out by the fact that neither the non-authoritarian attitude scales nor any of the reversed authoritarian scales load on this factor. Scores on the F and D scales and tendencies to give agree responses to both original and reversed authoritarian personality scale items cluster together very closely.

All of the measures of the tendency to use the "Undecided" response category load on one end of factor 2 and all five counts of disagree-agree responses to the original and reversed authoritarian scales load at the other end. Note that the loadings of C - Reversed C and A-S/Reversed A-S are relatively attenuated. These factors will be integrated into the remainder of the findings shortly. The high loadings (above $|.40|$) on factor 2 are given in Table 4. As simple logic would imply, indicisive responses are the empirical opposite of the tendency to agree with original authoritatian personality items and to desagree with their reversals.

Table 4

High Loadings on Factor 2

Scale	Loading
No. Undecided Responses to A.P. Scales	.86
No. Undecided Responses to Reversed A.P. Scales	.85
No. Undecided Responses to Attitude Scales	.76
Total Disagree-Agree Responses to A.P. Scales	-.85
No. Disagree-Agree Responses to F - Reversed F	-.75
No. Disagree-Agree Responses to D - Reversed D	-.72
No. Disagree-Agree Responses to C - Reversed C	-.53
No. Disagree-Agree Responses to A-S/Reversed A-S	-.51

Being "Undecided" is the empirical opposite of disagreeing with original A.P. items and agreeing with reversals. But it is not "undecided" responses to A.P. scales alone that are negatively related to the disagree-agree tendency; systematic use of the "Undecided" category on non-A.P. scales also loads on the opposite pole. The prediction seems justified that people who make systematic use of the "Undecided" response on non-A.P. scales will also use it on A.P. scales and will not use the disagree-agree pattern on A.P. scales and their reversals.

The variables that load highly upon factor 3 are given in Table 5. The loadings of the E and A-S scales at one pole and of the Worldmindedness and Civil Rights scales at the other pole support the contention that factor 3 reflects ethnocentrism and anti-Semitism and their antithesis. At first glance it appears odd that the reversed A-S Scale loads on the same pole

Table 5

High Loadings on Factor 3

Scale	Loading
Ethnocentrism Scale	.57
Anti-Semitism Scale	.80
Reversed Anti-Semitism Scale	.62
Worldminded Scale	- .65
Civil Rights Scale	- .57
No. Agree-Agree Responses to A-S/Reversed A-S	.58
No. Agree-Disagree Responses to A-S/Reversed A-S	.67
No. Disagree-Agree Responses to A-S/Reversed A-S	- .69

as the A-S Scale. However, inspection of several reversed A-S items (Table 6) reveals that logical reversals of A-S scale items do not necessarily destroy the specifically anti-Jewish content of the items. The items in Table 6 convey nearly as high a degree of anti-Jewish sentiment as do the

Table 6

Examples of Reversed A-S Scale Items

8. There are many more important steps to be taken in cleaning up the movies and generally improving the situation in Hollywood than putting an end to Jewish domination there.
10. There are better ways to eliminate the Communist menace in this country than controlling the Jewish element.
12. As a general rule, hotels should not deny admittance to Jews.

original items. Because of this fact, the number of double agree responses loads at the anti-Semitic end of the factor. It is apparent then that the

items in the A-S and reversed A-S scales are obviously not so heavily freighted with the agreement bias characteristics of the F and D scales that they are responded to primarily on a basis other than their content. Therefore, given the basically content oriented responses, the number of agree-disagree responses loads at the anti-Semitic end of the factor and the number of disagree-agree responses loads at the other. It is for this reason that the disagree-agree loading was alternated on factor 2; although it reflects a systematic rejection of authoritarian ideas, it is more closely tuned to specific content in the case of the A-S Scale.

Factor 4 is an extreme-response set factor. As can be seen in Table 7, all of the measures of the tendency to give extreme responses load at the same pole of factor 4. A person who tends to give many "Strongly Agree" responses to A.P. scales also tends to give many "Strongly Disagree" responses to A.P. scales and many "Strongly Agree" responses and many "Strongly Disagree" responses to non-A.P. attitude scales. An extreme responder tends to use

Table 7

High Loadings on Factor 4

Variable	Loading
Political Position Self Rating	.40
No. Strongly Agree Responses to A.P. Scales	.61
No. Strongly Disagree Responses to A.P. Scales	.67
No. Strongly Agree Responses to Reversed A.P. Scales	.62
No. Strongly Disagree Responses to Reversed A.P. Scales	.73
No. Strongly Agree Responses to Attitude Scales	.70
No. Strongly Disagree Responses to Attitude Scales	.75

extreme categories in all situations. This result is in agreement with Walsh's earlier (1963, 1965) findings. The Political Position Self Rating loads on

this factor presumably because it involves a 100-point scale with "0" being "absolutely conservative" and "100" being "absolutely liberal". This variable loads only .40 on factor 4. It is the highest loading of the variable and it is on the hypothesized factor, but it has a low communality (h^2 = .21).

The variables that load highly on factor 5 are listed in Table 8. They indicate that the factor represents a negativism tendency or perhaps a rejection

Table 8

High Loadings on Factor 5

Variable	Loading
Total Disagree-Disagree Responses to A.P. Scales	.84
No. Disagree-Disagree Responses to F - Reversed F	.58
No. Disagree-Disagree Responses to D - Reversed D	.56
No. Disagree-Disagree Responses to C - Reversed C	.60
No. Disagree-Disagree Responses to A-S/Reversed A-S	.58

of all items in the A.P. vein whether they are stated positively or negatively. These variables form a tight cluster. Their only appreciable loadings are on this factor and these substantial. Not even the A-S scale double-disagree score is pulled out of the cluster because of its highly specific content.

Factor 6 represents a bipolar opposition of economic (and to a lesser extent social and political) extremism and moderation. As can be seen from Table 9, both C and reversed-C load at one pole of this factor. The reason for this apparent contradiction is that the reversals of the C items represent not economic liberalism, but economic radicalism. Several examples of these item reversals are given in Table 10. At the other pole of factor 6 load the liberal-keyed Liberal-Conservatism Scale and Modern Political Attitudes Scale, both of which are heavily weighted with economic statements.

Table 9

High Loadings on Factor 6

Variable	Loading
Conservatism Scale	- .63
Reversed C Scale	- .63
Liberalism-Conservatism Scale	.58
Modern Political Attitudes Scale	.54
No. Agree-Disagree Responses to C - Reversed C	- .79
No. Disagree-Agree Responses to C - Reversed C	.52

As was the case with the A-S Scale, the basically content-determined responses to the C and reversed-C scales cause the agree-disagree and disagree-agree variables specific to this scale to load appreciably at the negative and positive poles of this factor, respectively. The C Scale does not appear

Table 10

Examples of Reversed C Items

3. The production of power and energy such as electricity should be owned and operated by the government.
4. The government should own and operate the production of basic materials, such as iron and steel.
5. All large industries should be owned and operated by the government.
8. It is the responsibility of the government to take whatever action may be necessary to achieve and maintain full employment.

to be heavily freighted with the characteristics that induce the agreement response set in F and D.

Factor 7 seems to re-emphasize that reversing an item logically does not necessarily reverse its polarity on some substantive dimension. As can be seen from Table 11, the total number of agree-disagree responses to the

Table 11

High Loadings on Factor 7

Variable	Loading
Reversed F Scale	.45
Reversed D Scale	.54
Total Agree-Disagree Responses to A.P. Scales	.54
Total Agree-Disagree Responses to F- Reversed F	.58
Total Agree-Disagree Responses to D - Reversed D	.58

A.P. scales and to F-Reversed F and to D-Reversed D load on the same pole of factor 7 as do reversed D and reversed F. The agree-disagree pattern should indicate some consistent agreement to the authoritarian position. Therefore, reversed F and reversed D should load on the opposite pole from these variables to the extent that they load at all. The fact that they load at the same pole seems to say that reversed D and reversed F items are so worded that the authoritarian position shows clearly. Note that all these variables load substantially but not highly on this factor which probably indicates that it is difficult to be consistent with F-reversed F and D-reversed D and that reversals of F and D tend to be authoritarian in tone, but no more than that.

The variables with high loadings on factor 8 are given in Table 13. Since the Militarism-Pacifism Scale is keyed in the pacifist direction and the Humanitarianism Scale and the Capital Punishment Scale are keyed in their respective "anti" directions, it is probably that factor 8 is a humanitarianism factor. The Nationalism Scale, which loaded highly on this factor with the original sample almost completely washed out in this sample. Its

Table 12

High Loadings on Factor 8

Variable	Loading
Militarism-Pacifism Scale	- .62
Humanitarianism Scale	.77
Capital Punishment Scale	.70

highest loading was on factor 1 and that was only - .42. The communality of the scale is only .37. Sampling error seems as likely an explanation as any for this result.

SUMMARY

The following points seem worthy of emphasis in summarizing the outcome of this study:

1) responses to the F and D scales appear to be influenced primarily by an agreement response set;

2) this response set is independent of both indecisive responding and logical evaluation of authoritarian personality scale items and their reversals;

3) there remains a distinct anti-Semitic attitude in our culture which is not an artifact of response biases or sets; in particular, it is not an artifact of the set to respond to attitude items in an extreme fashion, a response bias documented in this study;

4) there exists in our culture an attitude which espouses extreme economic positions independent of their humanitarian aspects;

5) many individuals reject the entire authoritarian personality attitudinal frame of reference, possibly because of the ambiguity of the terms in which it is stated and possibly because of the artificial sound (to contemporary ears) of the way its tenets are stated.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, R.N. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

Peabody, D. Authoritarianism scales and response bias. Psychological Bulletin, 1966, 65, 11-23.

Walsh, J.A. A factorial study of a large sample of response set and attitude scales. (Doctoral disertation, University of Washington, 1963). Dissertation Abstracts, 1964. (University Microfilms No. 64-4541).